

REMARKS

Independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate therein the limitations of dependent claim 2. Consequently, claim 2 is canceled. Claim 1 is also amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner.

Independent claim 8 is amended to incorporate a limitation that the protective shield is to include a refractory-lined portion.

The Examiner indicated that claim 2 is allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claim 2 is dependent directly from claim 1 and, thus, the incorporation of the limitations of claim 2 into claim 1 should place it in allowable form. Claims 3-7 are dependent either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and, thus, should also be allowable.

Independent claim 8 is directed to a method of protecting a feed nozzle by use of a protective shield similar to that of claim 1. The amendment to claim 8 provides a limitation that requires the protective shield to include a refractory-lined portion similar to the limitation of claim 2. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment of claim 8 places it in allowable form and that dependent claim 9 is, therefore, also allowable.

In view of the above amendments, the 35 USC §102 and 35 USC §103 rejections are believed to now be moot.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and 3-9, as they are now amended, are allowable. Early allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERNARDUS M. GEERTSHUIS,
JASON A. HORWEGE, YE MON CHEN,
and RENE SAMSON

By



Their Attorney, Charles W. Stewart
Registration No. 34,023
(713) 241-0360

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463